

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/538,462	06/10/2005	Serge Mathieu Roggeband	TS6417 US	3799
23632 SHELL OIL CO	7590 04/20/200 OMPANY	EXAMINER		
P O BOX 2463 HOUSTON, TX 772522463			NEUDER, WILLIAM P	
HOUSTON, 12	X 112322403		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3672	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		04/20/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/538,462	ROGGEBAND, SERGE MATHIEU			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		William P. Neuder	3672			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication apport Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
VHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLICATION OF THE MAILING DISCONNESS OF THE MAILING THE MAILIN	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tir will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)🖂	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 Ju	une 2005.				
·		s action is non-final.				
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	ion of Claims					
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)□	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠	S)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-3,5-10,12 and 13</u> is/are rejected.					
7)🖂	Claim(s) 4 and 11 is/are objected to.	•	•			
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers		•			
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc	epted or b) objected to by the	Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage						
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).						
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
	:					
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
	te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal F				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/10/05 Other:						

Application/Control Number: 10/538,462

Art Unit: 3672

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public, use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-3,5,6,12 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Trzeciak et al 4729675.

Trzeciak discloses a system for axially coupling a tubular end 23 with a mandrel 42. The system comprises a tubular end 23, a mandrel 42 for inserting into the tubular end in axial alignment thereof, thereby forming an annular space. Two or more transmission units (66,76) are arranged for axially coupling the tubular end with the mandrel. The Belleville spring 58 compresses the various ball bearing race members towards one another with spacer sleeves (64,70,75,78) fixing the bearing races in selected positions (col. 5, lines 40-43). The assembly comprising (23,56,58,59,64,66,70,71,75,76,78,34) forming a rigid assembly that is only disrupted due to ball failure. In normal circumstances, the transmission units (66,76) are arranged for axially coupling the tubular end with the mandrel. The transmission units comprise a first fixing element (66,76, a second fixture element (89,100), and spacer means (61,96,98) for maintaining an axial displacement between the first fixture element and the second fixture element. The first fixture element is axially connected to an inner surface of the tubular and the second fixture element is axially connected to the

mandrel. As to claim 2, the transmission units are interconnected to form a string of interconnected transmission units. As to claim 3, the arrangement of the bearings and spacer sleeves can be rearranged. (See col. 7). This is considered a means for adjusting the axial displacement. As to claim 5, Belleville springs are provided in combination with the spacers to provide axial resilience. As to claim 6, the Belleville springs have differing stiffness. As to claim 12, bearing elements and bearing races are provided (59,66,71111,76). As to claim 13, the tubular end is a first tubular end and the mandrel is a second tubular end.

Page 3

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Trzeciak et al (described above).

Art Unit: 3672

Claims 7-10 all call for locking means for locking the first and/or the second fixture elements. While Trzeciak does not disclose locking means, it would have been considered obvious to provide bolt type locking means for the fixing elements to ensure that the fixing elements do not become undone.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to William P. Neuder whose telephone number is 571-272-7032. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David J. Bagnell can be reached on 571-272-6999. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3672

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

William P Neuder Primary Examiner Art Unit 3672

mile po

W.P.N.